-8

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,121	10/09/2003	Han Moon	0465-1051P	8086

2292 7590 03/27/2007
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
OKORONKWO, CHINWENDU C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2136	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/27/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/27/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/681,121	MOON, HAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chinwendu C. Okoronkwo	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 October 2003*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☒ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) as follows:

> Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a certified English translation of the foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).
>
> Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that no IDS have yet to be received with this application submitted on 10/09/2003.

Oath/Declaration

3. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that the Oath/Declaration submitted on 03/21/2004 has been received and considered.

Drawings

4. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that the drawings submitted on 10/09/2003 have been received, considered.

Specification

5. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that the Specification submitted on 10/09/2003 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the code certification table" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the user ID" in line12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The Examiner has provided a number of examples of the claim deficiencies in the above, however, the list of deficiencies may not be all inclusive. Applicant should refer to these as examples of deficiencies and should make all the necessary corrections to eliminate the specification objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are directed toward "a user certificate method for data broadcasting." It is unclear how these claims can be directed towards both a user certificate and a method simultaneously. It is understood within the art to direct claims towards a user certificate used in data broadcasting or towards a method for data broadcasting, but not both simultaneously.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being disclosed by Iwafune et al. (US Patent No. 5,880,720)

Regarding claim 1, Iwafune et al., discloses a user certificate method for data broadcasting comprising the steps of:

- inputting a code recollection starting key on a remote control device during a user watches a data broadcasting (Figure 17 and col. 16 lines 1-16);
- extracting a program title from an Electronic Program Guide table received from a broadcasting station (col. 7 lines 8-17);
- inputting a successive sequence of keys for user certification (col. 2 lines 32-46);
- inputting a code recollection end key on the remote control device for finishing the inputting of the sequence of keys (Figure 17 and col. 16 lines 1-16);
- inputting a user code according to a screen displayed after inputting the code recollection key (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25); and
- storing a record having the user code, the program title and the input key sequence in the code certificate table (col. 6 lines 38-50, col. 6 lines 59-65 and col. 19 lines 35-47).

Regarding claim 2, Iwafune et al., discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the step of inputting a successive sequence of keys includes the step of inputting a user ID and a password (col. 18 lines 52-67 and col. 19 lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 3, Iwafune et al., discloses the method as claimed in claim 2, further comprising the steps of:

- querying whether the user uses the same user ID and password for all broadcasting programs (col. 20 lines 11-27); and
- if `Yes` is selected to the query, setting a flag representing use of the same user ID and password for all the broadcasting program to `ON` (Figure 17 and col. 19 lines 5-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwafune et al. (US Patent No. 5,880,720) and further in view of Sakata (US Patent No. 7,110,018).

Regarding claim 4, Iwafune et al., discloses a user certificate method for data broadcasting comprising the steps of:

(b) inputting a user code according to a screen displayed after the code shortcut key is inputted (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25);

(c) determining existence of the user code on a code certificate table (col. 6 lines 38-50, col. 6 lines 59-65 and col. 19 lines 35-47);

(d) if the user code exists on the code certificate table, reading program titles for the user code from the code certificate table, and determining existence of a program title the same with a program title under watching presently out of the program titles (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27);

(e) if same program title exists, reading an input key sequence for the user code and the program title from the code certificate table (col. 19 lines 36-47); and

(f) transferring the user ID and the password of the input key sequence to the broadcasting station (col. 20 lines 11-27).

Iwafune et al. is silent in disclosing inputting a code shortcut key on a remote control device during watching a data broadcasting (he does implicitly hint towards such an analogous element in column 18 lines 19-23), however, Sakata does disclose such a limitation (col. 1 lines 26-37, specifically lines 31-34 of Sakata).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. with the communication terminal of Sakata. Sakata provides motivation for this combination in the recitation of the "since a remote controller is used as the main control system of each device, it is unsuitable for complicated input operation ... the operability of the input is bad." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. and its remote control (Figure 17) with the communication terminal of Sakata and its remote control (col. 1 lines 31-34) is clear. The shortcut key of the remote controller disclosed by Sakata would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in that the television remote control would be able to handled "complicated input" such as the key sequence claimed within the instant application.

Regarding claim 5, Iwafune et al., is silent in disclosing the method as claimed in claim 4, further comprising the step of displaying a message `no same user code exists` on a screen in a case there is no user code as a result of the determination in the step (c). However, it would have been obvious to provide a non-affirmative response/message to the user if a transaction does not complete as intended. Iwafune et al. provides motivation for the obviousness modification reasoning in the recitation of col. 17 lines 62-65 in which a screen is displayed after transaction establishment information is received, which can contain either be a positive or negative message. Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. is clear. Such a message would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. by increasing user satisfaction - keeping users informed of the status of operations – thus making the system as a whole more user friendly.

Regarding claim 6, Iwafune et al., is silent in disclosing the user method as claimed in claim 4, further comprising the step of displaying a message `no data on the present program exits` on a screen in a case there is no same program as a result of the determination in the step (d). However, it would have been obvious to provide a non-affirmative response/message to the user if a transaction does not complete as intended. Iwafune et al. provides motivation for the obviousness modification reasoning in the recitation of col. 17 lines 62-65 in which a screen is displayed after transaction establishment information is received, which can contain either be a positive or negative message. Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. is clear. Such a message would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. by increasing user satisfaction - keeping users informed of the status of operations – thus making the system as a whole more user friendly.

Regarding claim 7, Iwafune et al., discloses the certificate method for data broadcasting comprising the steps of:

(b) inputting a user code according to a screen displayed after the code shortcut key is inputted (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25);

(c) determining existence of the user code on a code certificate table (col. 6 lines 38-50, col. 6 lines 59-65 and col. 19 lines 35-47);

(d) if the user code exists on the code certificate table, reading program titles for the user code from the code certificate table, and determining existence of a program title the same with a program title under watching presently out of the program titles (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27);

(e) if no same program title exists, determining whether a flag for indicating use of the same user ID and password for all broadcasting programs is set to `ON` or not (col. 19 lines 36-47);

(f) if the flag is set to `ON`, reading an input key sequence for the user code from the code certificate table (col. 19 lines 36-47); and

(g) transferring the user ID and password of the input key sequence to the broadcasting station (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27).

<u>Iwafune et al.</u> is silent in explicitly disclosing inputting a code shortcut key on a remote control device during watching a data broadcasting (he does implicitly hint towards such an analogous element in column 18 lines 19-

23), however, Sakata does disclose such a limitation (col. 1 lines 26-37, specifically lines 31-34 of Sakata).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. with the communication terminal of Sakata. Sakata provides motivation for this combination in the recitation of the "since a remote controller is used as the main control system of each device, it is unsuitable for complicated input operation ... the operability of the input is bad." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. and its remote control (Figure 17) with the communication terminal of Sakata and its remote control (col. 1 lines 31-34) is clear. The shortcut key of the remote controller disclosed by Sakata would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in that the television remote control would be able to handled "complicated input" such as the key sequence claimed within the instant application.

Regarding claim 8, Iwafune et al., is silent in disclosing the method as claimed in claim 7, further comprising the step of displaying a message `no data on the present program exists` on a screen in a case the flag is not set to `ON` as a result of the determination in the step (e). However, it would have been obvious to provide a non-affirmative response/message to the user if a transaction does not complete as intended. Iwafune et al. provides motivation for the obviousness modification reasoning in the recitation of col. 17 lines 62-65 in which a screen is displayed after transaction establishment information is received, which can contain either be a positive or negative message. Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. is clear. Such a message would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. by increasing user satisfaction - keeping users informed of the status of operations – thus making the system as a whole more user friendly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwafune et al. (US Patent No. 5,880,720), Sakata (US Patent No. 7,110,018), and further in view of Jung (US Patent No. 6,483,553).

Regarding claim 9, Iwafune et al., discloses a user certificate system for a data broadcasting comprising:

a first memory for storing a code certificate table for writing a record having a user code, a program title, and an input key sequence thereon during watching the digital TV receiver (Figure 16 element 84);

- a second memory for storing a flag indicating whether the same user ID and password are used for all broadcasting program (Figure 16 element 83);

- a settop box having the first and second memories and extracting a program title from an Electronic Program Guide table received from a broadcasting station (col. 7 lines 8-17 of Iwafune et al.); and
- a remote control device including, a code recollection starting key for starting application of a successive key sequence for user certificate (Figure 17 of Iwafune et al.),
- a code recollection end key for ending the application of a successive key sequence for the user certificate (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25 of Iwafune et al.).

Iwafune et al. in view of Sakata is silent in disclosing a digital TV receiver for receiving a digital TV broadcasting, however Jung does disclose such a limitation (col. 5 lines 65-67 and col. 6 lines 1-4 of Jung).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. in view of the communication terminal of Sakata with the TV receiver for digital/analog combined use of Jung. Jung provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, "the digital TV broadcasting systems will use channels the present analog (radio) broadcasting systems do not use, frequently. Therefore, the digital TV broadcasting signals can be received by an existing analog TV antenna. Moreover, an output frequency band of a digital tuner is also similar to an output frequency band of a tuner of an existing analog TV receiver." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. in further view of the communication terminal of Sakata and their remote controls with the TV receiver for digital/analog combined use of Jung is clear. The digital TV receiver disclosed by Jung is would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in further view of the communication terminal of Sakata in that it allows the users of the television system to receive higher quality picture and sound – thus increasing satisfaction levels. Also this modification would allow the television system communication combination to take advantage of the more modern technology of digital TV broadcasting, which will – in the very near future - become the standard form of TV broadcasting.

Iwafune et al. is silent in disclosing a code shortcut key for carrying out a user code certificate procedure by a simple method (he does implicitly hint towards such an analogous element in column 18 lines 19-23), however, Sakata does disclose such a limitation (col. 1 lines 26-37, specifically lines 31-34 of Sakata).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. with the communication terminal of Sakata. Sakata provides motivation for this combination in the recitation of the "since a remote controller is used as the main control system of each device, it is unsuitable for complicated input operation ... the operability of the input is bad." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. and its remote control (Figure 17) with the communication terminal of Sakata and its remote control (col. 1 lines 31-34) is clear. The shortcut key of the remote controller disclosed by Sakata would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in that the television remote control would be able to handled "complicated input" such as the key sequence claimed within the instant application.

Regarding claim 10, Iwafune et al., discloses the user certificate system as claimed in claim 9, wherein the first and second memories are non-volatile (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27).

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chinwendu C. Okoronkwo whose telephone number is (571) 272 2662. The examiner can normally be reached on MWF 9:30 - 7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CCO
March 19, 2007

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

3/20/07